



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/919,895	08/02/2001	Alison Joan Lennon	169.2140	4521

5514 7590 08/11/2004

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

HWANG, JOON H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2172

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/919,895

Applicant(s)

LENNON ET AL.

Examiner

Joon H. Hwang

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The claims 1-62 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-12 and 17-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Libert et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,574,655).

With respect to claim 1, Libert discloses a system for associatively managing distributed multimedia assets, wherein the system containing metadata collections, which can be queried, associated with the multimedia assets (abstract, fig. 6, and fig. 8). Libert teaches a metadata server associated with each content provider and operable as a description-generating process for communicating with a user agent, end-user application (description-receiving process, fig. 6, fig. 8, lines 13-33 in col. 2, lines 13-18 in col. 5, lines 15-67 in col. 11). Libert does not explicitly disclose the metadata server performs operations such as, interpreting a received request and formatting accessed information. However, Libert discloses a resource broker that represents a metadata server (fig. 6, fig. 8, lines 20-23 in col. 4, lines 6-9 in col. 5, and lines 43-49 in col. 10). Thus, the resource broker teaches the metadata server. Libert discloses the resource broker (the metadata server) receiving a request for descriptions from the user agent

Art Unit: 2172

(the description-receiving process) in a predetermined request format (lines 7-10 in col. 3, lines 19-23 in col. 4, lines 52-63 in col. 5, line 46 in col. 6 thru line 3 in col. 7, and lines 14-16 in col. 13). Libert discloses the resource broker parsing and converting (teaching interpreting) the received request according to the predetermined request format (line 46 in col. 6 thru line 3 in col. 7 and lines 32-42 in col. 10). Libert discloses the resource broker accessing the information about multimedia assets in the metadata collection of content provider in response to the interpreted request (lines 15-67 in col. 11 and lines 1-17 in col. 12, and lines 14-63 in col. 13). Libert discloses the resource broker formatting the accessed information as a description according to a predetermined schema, the resulting description containing at least one link, which represents a return request to the metadata server (line 47 in col. 6 thru line 3 in col. 7, line 55 in col. 7 thru line 50 in col. 8, and lines 1-57 in col. 12). Libert discloses the resource broker sending the formatted description to the user agent (lines 14-16 in col. 13). Libert discloses the user agent or the end-user application accessible to and operable by a user, a customer (lines 13-44 in col. 2), and providing the user an interface to access description of multimedia assets generated from multiple metadata servers (lines 4-10 in col. 5 and fig. 2). Therefore, based on Libert, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the resource broker that represents a metadata server performing the operations discussed above in order to handle a user request in heterogeneous systems.

With respect to claim 2, Libert discloses each metadata collection is stored in a corresponding database (fig. 6, fig. 8, and lines 11-24 in col. 5).

Art Unit: 2172

With respect to claim 3, Libert discloses each metadata collection is stored in structured or semi-structured files (fig. 6, fig. 8, and lines 25-39 in col. 11).

With respect to claim 4, Libert discloses the resource broker (metadata server) identified by a uniform resource identifier (line 55 in col. 7 thru line 50 in col. 8, and lines 30-38 in col. 9).

With respect to claim 5, Libert teaches the request to the resource broker (metadata server) is included in the uniform resource identifier identifying the resource broker (line 60 in col. 10 thru line 14 in col. 11).

With respect to claim 6, Libert discloses the descriptions are in XML (lines 32-42 in col. 10 and line 47 in col. 6 thru line 3 in col. 7).

With respect to claims 7 and 8, Libert discloses the predetermined scheme specifies the structure and syntax of a description by using the XML schema language (line 47 in col. 6 thru line 3 in col. 7).

With respect to claims 9-11, Libert discloses the link has a defined source and target, wherein the link source is an element containing the identity of the link target and the link target is represented using a uniform resource locator (line 55 in col. 7 thru line 50 in col. 8).

With respect to claim 12, Libert discloses the link target identifies the same metadata server (resource broker) that generated the link (line 55 in col. 7 thru line 50 in col. 8, line 47 in col. 6 thru line 3 in col. 7, and lines 1-17 in col. 12).

With respect to claim 17, Libert discloses an agent answers queries and recommendations about services provided by the other agents in the system to the

Art Unit: 2172

agent community that includes the user agent (line 47 in col. 6 thru line 3 in col. 7 and line 51 in col. 8 thru line 5 in col. 9).

With respect to claim 18, Libert discloses the resource broker is built by a developer from a resource broker toolkit concerning the metadata server is constructed from a common customizable module and native APIs allowing developers and vendors to integrate their product with the system concerning the module being customized for association with a content provider by an interpreter for translation of a request (line 66 in col. 4 thru line 24 in col. 5 and lines 28-45 in col. 16).

The limitations of claims 19, 61, and 62 are rejected in the analysis of claim 1 above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claim 20 are rejected in the analysis of claim 13 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 21, Libert teaches a user interface configured for presenting the translated description (metadata) to the user and a login module by which the user may access, for consideration provided to the content provider (search result), at least one multimedia item from the presented description (lines 6-56 in col. 9 and lines 28-45 in col.16).

The limitations of claim 22 are rejected in the analysis of claim 6 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 23, Libert teaches the user interface arranged to reproduce a part of multimedia item (lines 35-44 in col. 2, lines 46-56 in col. 9, lines 43-59 in col. 10, lines 32-57 in col. 12, and lines 28-45 in col. 16).

With respect to claim 24, Libert discloses thumbnail multimedia images (lines 25-29 in col. 2).

The limitations of claims 25-36 are rejected in the analysis of claims 1-12 above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claims 37-48 are rejected in the analysis of claims 1-12 above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claims 49-60 are rejected in the analysis of claims 1-12 above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

4. Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Libert et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,574,655) in view of Ferguson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,819,092).

With respect to claims 13-16, Libert discloses the claimed subject matter as discussed above except monitoring a number of requests made to a metadata server. However, Ferguson discloses a metering tool that monitors a number of requests made to a server and a fee setter that invoices the corresponding content provider for the number of requests (lines 15-23 in col. 12, lines 30-39 and 50-54 in col. 18, line 43 in col. 37 thru line 14 in col. 38, lines 27-59 in col. 30, and line 32-59 in col. 31). Ferguson discloses automatically levying and paying fees according to the fee setter instructions (lines 35-44 in col. 29). Ferguson discloses a charge identification code for the content provider (lines 32-45 in col. 35 and lines 14-63 in col. 36), which is accessed for fee computations. Ferguson discloses the metering tool and the fee setter are programs

Art Unit: 2172

that provide particular types of functionality to the online service (abstract). Therefore, based on Libert in view of Ferguson, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the programs of Ferguson, such as the metering tool and the fee setter, to the system of Libert in order to install such functionalities provided by the programs for sales and marketing purpose.


5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joon H. Hwang whose telephone number is 703-305-6469. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00(M~F).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JOHN E BREENE can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Joon Hwang
5/14/04




JOHN BREENE
SENIOR PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100